been sanctioned and given effect to. Pending final disposal of the question, he prayed for the levy of *banjar kandayam* and for the grant of remission equal to the difference in assessment calculated at the wet and the dry *bagayet* rates on lands irrigated by tank and well water.

The PRESIDENT replied that the question had been investigated by the Engineering Department and their decision in the matter also communicated to the member. As such no object would be served by discussing it once again in the House.

No. 18.—Creation of irrigation facilities in Gundlupet Taluk.

Messrs. K. C. SUBBANNA, Chamarajanagar Taluk ; and **BASAPPA,** Gundlupet Taluk.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA prayed that irrigation facilities be provided as early as possible in the Gundlupet Taluk where there are no facilities at present. In this connection, he suggested the construction of an *anicut* across Molehole and undertaking repairs of a major tank in the taluk.

The PRESIDENT replied that the suggestion would be considered.

No. 19.—Waiving of interest on overdue instalment of contribution amount.

Mr. Patel SIDDE GOWDA, T-Narsipur Taluk.

Mr. Patel SIDDE GOWDA represented that the instalments of contribution amount fixed on lands under *nalas* had fallen into arrear already on account of the present economic depression and would continue to be so for various causes. The rate of contribution itself was as high as Rs. 180 under certain *nalas* and it had become very difficult for the landholders to pay the balance of the amount due. On this account, the levy of interest on overdue instalments was working as a great hardship on the raiyats. He therefore prayed that in the interests of the poor raiyats and in view of the economic depression, levy of interest on overdue amounts be kindly ordered to be waived.

Mr. H. HOMBE GOWDA said that the contribution under the Kagebora *nala*, from which water was not being given on two days in the week and under which the lands were second-rate ones, was as high as Rs. 150 as against Rs. 80 in the Irwin Cannal area and under the Bannur Tank under which the lands were very fertile. Also, no interest was levied on overdue instalments in the Irwin Cannal area. The raiyats under the Kagebora *nala* were already feeling it difficult to pay dry assessment, water-rate and contribution, and the Government would, by forcing them to pay interest on overdue instalments in addition, be taking the life out of the raiyats. For these reasons, he prayed that the interest be waived.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar) said that interest would be levied not on all instalments but only on overdue instalments and that too at a reduced rate. There was nothing wrong in such a procedure. It was obligatory on the part of persons to pay punctually the arrears due to Government and, failing that, to pay interest on overdue amounts. In fact the levy of interest on overdue instalments of contribution was necessary in the interests of punctual recovery of arrears due, and under the *mutchalikas* executed by them, the amount was recoverable as a land revenue arrear. The question whether under the Irwin Canal area or in any other channel area, the procedure adopted was the same in respect of recovery of contribution was altogether different. As a result of allowing payment of the contribution amount in instalments, Government were already incurring a loss by way of interest. They could not incur any further loss by waiving the interest on overdue instalments. For these reasons, it would not be possible for the Government to accede to the request of the members.

The Assembly rose for the day at 11-45 a.m. to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.

FOURTH DAY.

Thursday, 29th October 1936.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Thursday,

V. 31 'N 36
N 37
(B) A 684

29th October 1936, at 12 of the clock, *Rajamantrapravina* S. P. Rajagopalachari, First Member of Council, in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Lower Candle-Power Bulbs for Village Panchayets.

Q.—19. **Mr. M. RAME GOWDA** (Chintamani Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) what is the candle-power of bulbs used for electric street lights in villages in the State in the several village panchayets ;

(*b*) what is the amount realised annually by Government for each of these lights ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Diwan Bahadur N. N. Ayyangar).**—

(*a*) The street lights in villages are of 20, 40 and 60 watts corresponding to 16, 36 and 54 candle-power, respectively.

(*b*) The rate of royalty charged is Rs. 15, 18 and 22-8-0 per annum for 20, 40 and 60 watts, respectively.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—What is the candle-power of bulbs used in village panchayets and that used in municipalities ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—There are no restrictions as regards the candle-power of bulbs to be used in village panchayets, but municipalities have to instal 60-watt bulbs.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—Will village panchayets be supplied with 40-watt bulbs instead of 60-watt bulbs ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—The matter will be considered if the village panchayets represent to that effect.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—If Rs. 22-8-0 is the royalty for 54 candle-power what will it be for one candle-power ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—That is not how the royalty is calculated.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—For 60 watts the royalty is Rs. 22-8-0 per annum. For 40 watts, the royalty should be Rs. 15 per annum on the same basis. By charging Rs. 18 per annum, as stated in the answer, are not the Government charging more ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—No. Working expenses have got to be taken into consideration. The net revenue is only about Rs. 4, 7 and 11 from 20, 40 and 60-watt lamps, respectively, which is roughly in proportion to the illumination.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—Is it not possible to supply 40-watt bulbs to municipalities instead of 60-watt bulbs as at present ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Not possible.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—Why is it not possible ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Even now the municipalities are being charged at a low rate. The standard candle-power for municipalities is 54 corresponding to 60-watts and if 40-watt bulbs are provided the rate charged will have to be still lower.

The CHIEF ELECTRICAL ENGINEER (Mr. F. N. Mowdawalla).—At present the department has provided 20, 40 and 60 watts for a royalty of Rs. 15, 18 and 22-8-0, respectively. In other words, for Rs 15 a year, a panchayet gets 20-watt bulbs all the year round. By paying only Rs. 3 more, it will get double the illumination, so that from the point of view of the raiyats it is better to have higher illumination at a slightly increased cost. Similarly in the case of 60-watt lamps, 50 per cent more illumination can be obtained on payment of 25 per cent more. As a matter of fact, even at the rate of Rs. 18 for 40 watts, the department earns only half an anna per unit. The bulk of the cost is due to interest, depreciation on the works, etc.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—But, since the municipalities are not in a position to pay the higher royalty of Rs. 22-8-0 per annum, why not the department give them 40-watt bulbs ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It is not possible to supply 40-watt bulbs to major municipalities as the revenue will not be adequate.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—These are all technical matters. Even at present, the department earns only about half an anna per unit. Supplying 40-watt